REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 13 and 15-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 10-12 are withdrawn. Claim 14 has been cancelled without prejudice by the amendments above. Claims 1and 13 are amended. New claims 15-22 have been added. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found at least in the claims as filed and in the example bridging pages 7 and 8 in the application as filed.

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouzier (U.S. Patent # 3,595,846) in view of Spott (DE 32 33 557). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As claim 1 stands amended by this Amendment and Response, the claimed apparatus must be adapted for removal and insertion of the pig receiving station without disrupting flow of the polymer emulsion. As claim 13 stands amended by this Amendment and Response, the pig receiving station must be releasably engaged to allow disengagement of the pig receiving station without disrupting flow of the polymer emulsion. Although the Applicants continue to disagree with the characterization of Rouzier in this a previous Office Actions, the Applicants fail to see any teaching or suggestion in Rouzier, even as characterized in the Office Action, that would allow removal, insertion or disengagement of a pig recieiving station without disrupting the flow of the polymer emulsion. Spott does not remedy this deficiency and on this basis alone this rejection of claims 1 and 13, as well as claims 2, 3, and 7-9 depending on claim 1, should be withdrawn.

The Office Action in rejecting claim 8 points to Rouzier, FIG. 2, for a disclosure of a reactor tube formed into at least one helical coil. Applicants respectfully disagree. Rouzier FIG. 2 discloses a stack of horizontal planes of tubes, not a helical coil, providing additonal basis for the withdrawal of the rejection of calim 8.

The Office Action in rejecting claim 6 acknowledges that Rouzier, Spott and Wennerberg et al are silent on the width of the slot increasing downstream, then finds that such a configuration would be obvious to one skilled in the art. Applicants

respectfully disagree. There is nothing in the references cited that would suggest to one skilled in the art to increase the width of the slot in the downstream direction, providing additional basis for withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6

In view of the amendments and comments above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner find the present application in condition for immediate allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

David H. Vickrey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 30,697

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
120 White Plains Road
Suite 300
Tarrytown, NY 10591-5522
(914) 333-7449